

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.]

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."—Paul.

[PAYABLE AT THE END OF SIX MONTHS.]

VOL. III.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1823.

No. 12.

Evangelical.

SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS....No. VIII. PART I.

When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, &c.—Matt. xxv. 31—46.

It is with great diffidence we attempt an explanation of the above parable; and the more we reflect on the little success which has attended the labors of others, on the same subject, as to settling the question, concerning its proper application, the less anxiety we have to publish our views to the world. Such a variety of opinions have been offered, that it seems improper again to disturb the public quiet, till a pen can be raised which is certain to carry truth and conviction to the reader. To write as we must, barely offering for the consideration of others, what to us appears most reasonable and scriptural, does at most, promise but little. But, to imitate the examples of too many modern scribblers, and imposingly imply—“Here are proofs of superior knowledge, and wisdom must die with us,” we have no inclination. Those who are deeply sensible of their own fallibility, will not dogmatize, where they ought to persuade.

In presenting an explanation of “the parable of the sheep and goats,” as it is frequently called, we shall not be so circumstantial and minute as was at first contemplated; but direct our illustration to those points, in which all believers in the final salvation of the world, disagree with all the advocates for the endless misery of the wicked. We shall neither be obsequious in following, nor fastidious in rejecting, those expositions which our brethren have offered; but in the pursuit of divine truth, endeavor to listen to the dictates of scripture and reason.

To pretend, as some in the height of zeal, have done, that the passage before us, is direct in proof of the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all mankind, appears to us unreasonable. And, on the other hand, to take it for granted that the passage relates to the final and unalterable state of men, exhibiting the blissful immortality of some, and the miserable eternity of others, is equally, if not more, absurd. Like most of the sayings of Jesus, it refers to events, far short of the final consummation of all things. Indeed, on close examination, we are decidedly of opinion, that but few parables, comparatively speaking, relate directly to the immortal state, or express the final destination of man, according to the infinite purpose and pleasure of God. Nothing appears more irrational than to force the meaning of every paragraph in the New Testament, where different characters are described, so as to make it relate to the immortal state of men. Such labored constructions on the scriptures, give rise to much unprofitable contention and disputation. Neither of the parables in the 25th chapter of Matthew, will admit of an application to the resurrection state of being, when fairly explained and dispassionately examined. We have not the shadow of a doubt, that they were intended to describe the different characters and conditions of men in the present mode of being, without having a direct allusion to what is commonly called, a future state. Even the parable which stands at the head of these observations, and which is called up, on almost every occasion, by the friends of future endless misery, as being fully descriptive of the day of Judgment and the unalterable destiny of the whole human family, comes infinitely short of proving the point, for which it is adduced. It is wholly owing to an habitual association of ideas and things, that we connect the incidents in the parable with the popular notion, of a day of judgment. It is not because there is anything essential in the parable that does, in reality, correspond with that notion; but it is because we have always heard the parable and the judgment-day, spoken of in connection, and they have become habitually associated in the mind. It is on the same principle that people who have been educated in the

Papal religion, think they are hearing of the “Church of Rome,” whenever the inspired words are quoted, which speak of the Church of Christ, or that they understand the divine authority of the Pope, by applying to him, the words which Jesus addressed to Peter, “I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” Now, when the veil is removed and real facts come to light, there will be no more agreement between the accounts in Matthew, and the popular day of judgment, than there is between the Church of Christ and the Mother of harlots; or between the real authority invested in Peter, and the divine power assumed by “his Holiness.” To the inquiring and candid reader, we hope to make this fact as clear as the light of noon-day. Wherefore, laying aside the fetters of false education, let us travel the path of truth and reason.

It is necessary for us to inquire whether we have adequate authority, for applying the passage under consideration, to a *future day of judgment*, when the whole human family shall be assembled, that each individual may be rewarded according to his works, with reference to his whole life. We certainly cannot pretend to any other authority for such an application, than the *ipse dixit* of fallible men. The divine author of the parable, did not say he was discoursing upon that subject. The inspired evangelist, who recorded the sayings of Jesus, gave no intimation that such was his meaning. Not only so, but the *characters* described are *peculiar*, and cannot, without presuming what ought to be proved, answer to the whole human family, under two general classes.—Look at that class which is called “righteous,” and ask on what principle or for what reasons, they are represented as such; and by a moment’s attention to the parable, you will find the reasons to be stated as follows, viz. “Because I was hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.” Now, according to the doctrine we oppose, every individual of Adam’s family will be eternally miserable, whose works do not correspond with the character described. Therefore, *all* who die in infancy and childhood; *all* in unchristianized lands, must be forever tormented. They have never fed, clothed, visited, nor relieved, either Christ or his disciples. As the parable does not intimate that any are righteous, except those who have actually performed those good works, it will of course exclude all others from the kingdom, if it be supposed to relate to the whole human family, and express their final condition. From this consideration, as well as many others, we are constrained to reject the popular application. It is destitute of reason, and favors a system of injustice and cruelty. Reflect for a moment on the absurdity of the doctrine. Imagine yourself present at the supposed judgment-day, and hear the judge utter the tremendous words, “Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels, For I was hungry and ye gave me no meat, &c.” Among those thus rejected, you behold *millions* of infants, who died before they could reciprocate a tender mother’s smile; *myriads* of thunder-struck immortals, whose lots were cast in uncivilized ignorance and wretchedness; innumerable multitudes, who were educated in Papal and Mahometan shades of death. And, alas! *all those* unfortunate fellow-beings, are to be judged guilty of endless, excruciating torments, for not having performed *impossibilities*. Where is the ingenuous reader, who will not turn with perfect abhorrence from a system of doctrine involving such injustice and cruelty?

That the above representation is just, cannot be denied by the candid and discriminating, of whatever persuasion. There is no other crime alledged against those on the left hand, than *not* having done those good works, which have been mentioned. It is therefore evident that all, of whatever age or condition, who have not fed, clothed, and relieved the disciples of Christ, must be forever miserable, if the

parable relate to the final destiny of men. Nothing, in our humble opinion, can be more irrational, than to suppose the two characters, above-named, are descriptive of all mankind. Is there not as much difference between an experienced veteran in wickedness, stained with crimes of the deepest dye, & a man of good moral habits, as there is between the *latter*, and the best christian on earth? And yet, according to the popular doctrine, the parable which describes the character of the finally damned, says nothing of worse people than such as have *not done* the works of singular kindness. We are of the opinion of a learned commentator; that those on “the left hand,” are *saints*, compared with many *professors* of religion.

Polemical.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

INFINITY OF SIN.

MR. EDITOR.—I have no wish to fill the columns of your valuable paper with a useless controversy; but a communication in your last, over the signature “T,” ought not perhaps, to pass unnoticed. This article was designed, it seems, to contain critical strictures on some desultory remarks which I had made in a former paper, on the “infinity of sin.” Impressed with the truth of the maxim, “to err is human,” I am disposed to pay a proper attention to any thing which may be offered with candor, on the incorrectness of my opinions or reasoning. There are however, some parts of T’s communication, which wear a more sarcastic aspect than I should have expected from a person of his years. Though free from the vehemence of youth, he is apparently a little tinctured with the superciliousness of age. He repeatedly tells us what “S. S.” ought to have done, with an assurance which seems to indicate a right to dictation. The word *philosophy* appears to have thrown him into a kind of learned ferment. He frequently alludes to the pretensions of “S. S.” to the knowledge of philosophical maxims; but no such pretensions are found in the article to which he alludes. All the philosophy which I have claimed as yet, is to know that a finite cause cannot produce an infinite effect. If however, there is any honor attached to the inuendoes of T, he will be permitted to enjoy it without molestation. My concern is with his arguments, which I must say, have not after the most patient examination, produced the least alteration in my views. His first attempt at direct criticism is extremely unfortunate: but I am inclined to attribute his mistake not so much to dull perception as to careless reading. In peeping for faults, critics are very apt to make gross blunders. This seems to be the misfortune of my opponent. He says, “S. S. denies the conclusion, that sin is an infinite evil because committed against a Being of infinite holiness and goodness.” The correctness of this conclusion, he says, “S. S. attempts to disprove by the following examples, ‘Is it certain that a man would be in love with gall, if he did not believe the quantity of it to be infinite? Is it certain that we are in love with orthodoxy, if we believe that the errors and mischiefs, which it produces in society, are not infinite, but limited?’ But here he is unaccountably mistaken. I did not adduce these examples to prove the infinitude of sin. I had said, ‘If we deny the conclusions that sin is an infinite evil, and deserves an infinite punishment, we are accused of being in love with sin,’ and asked, ‘Is this a natural conclusion?’ Is what a natural conclusion?—Why that ‘we are in love with sin, because we deny its infinity.’ To show the fallacy of inferring an attachment to sin from a denial of its proper infinity, the examples were produced, and whether appropriate to their subject or not, they furnish no excuse for a direct perversion. After this specimen however, T. will be under no necessity of multiplying examples to evince, that in common with others, he has the same claim to dullness of perception. But let us look at

the reasoning of my opponent. He sweeps away difficulties at a single stroke. To the argument for the finitude of sin, from the circumstance of its being "the act of a finite, dependent creature," he opposes the following: "If sin cannot be an infinite evil because committed by a finite being, it cannot be a finite evil because committed against an infinite being." There may be propriety in this reasoning, but at present I am unable to discover it. The fallacy lies, I apprehend, in supposing that the power opposing, assumes the properties of the power opposed. The following is probably of the same nature. Two statesmen are conversing on the consequences of a rebellion, which a faction has commenced against the laws of the commonwealth. A. says, the evil produced cannot be comparatively great, because the opposing power is small. B. replies, if the evil cannot be great, because the opposing power is small, it cannot be small, because the power opposed is great. Now that the reasoning of A. is correct, and that of B. fallacious, "daily experience, to use this writer's expression, furnishes us with many facts." But however this may be, my proposition stands unrefuted as yet, except by "bare assertions without any attempt to show their correctness." For aught therefore, that appears, it is just as certain that sin is not infinite, as "that an ounce does not weigh a ton, or that two and two are not a thousand."

To my second argument, "Sin is evidently not infinite because exceeded by grace," and the word of an apostle cited in support of it, "Where sin abounded, grace might much more abound"—T. replies, "The inspired writer speaks of the extension of sin, not of its nature, and therefore the words are cited to no purpose." But I adduced the words to prove that grace exceeds sin, and they prove it indubitably. They were therefore, cited to good purpose. Grace does not extend beyond infinity, but it extends beyond sin, therefore sin is not infinite. Infinity is not however, such an elastic thing as T. would seem to intend.

It does not, I apprehend, contract and exhaust the dullness of human perception, or the rigors of orthodoxy. But it is not true that

sin. grace might have reigned unto righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." It is hence evident, that grace exceeds sin, in its extension, in the power of its reign, and in its duration. The apostle therefore did not allude to "one subject, and S. S. to another."

My last proposition, "Sin is not infinite because it can be effectually done away," he admits is one of the most plausible arguments, he ever saw advanced, in favor of the finitude of sin. But he says, "S. S. should have considered in what sense sin is said to be infinite." In my turn, I may say, T. should have considered, that I contend that sin is not infinite in the proper sense of infinity. With any other sense, I have no contest at present. In every sense in which sin can properly be said to be infinite, it is as likely to take away the Lamb of God, as to be taken away by him.

But in the midst of these grave pretences of advocating the infinity of sin, T. with a single dash of the pen, overturns all he has written, by acknowledging that sin is not infinite. He says, "Sin is not, it is granted, an infinite evil in itself, because it must in that case, be an eternal evil. For infinity involves eternity!" This is sound argument, and refutes all he has written, and all he can write against the proper finitude of sin. It is evident from T's concession, that sin, to become infinite, must go out of itself.—While it is itself it will be finite. But what authority can he have for his intimation that there are some temporary, and some eternal infinities? It seems certain that the infinite something about which T. is writing is not sin itself. But he says, "An action may be one thing in itself, and another by accident." To this I shall only say, Whatever actions may become by accident, finitude does not, and cannot, by accident become infinity. S. S.

Honesty is the first grand principle, and may be called the foundation of the beautiful edifice of a moral character.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

"INFINITY OF SIN."

Mr. STREETER—After a few introductory remarks, your correspondent over the signature of "S. S." renews the discussion of this subject in the last number of your paper. Having, in his first communication, pronounced the doctrine unphilosophical, he labors in his second to prove it destitute of any support from the sacred scriptures. He enters into the consideration of a passage, which he assures us, has been cited in its defence. The passage referred to, is Job xxii. 5, "Is not thy wickedness great, and thine iniquities infinite?" From this passage, he maintains, the doctrine can derive no support. The passage contains two parts, each of which he separately examines. In the first part, mention is made of the nature of the sins of which Job had been guilty, and in the second, of their number. I am perfectly willing to admit that the infinity spoken of in the latter part of the passage is not to be taken in the strictly literal signification of the word, but in a limited or qualified sense. For if the offences of Job were strictly speaking, infinite in their number, it would have been absurd in his accuser to attempt an enumeration of them as he does in the succeeding verses. Having made this concession, I shall now maintain, in opposition to this writer, that, by the greatness spoken of in the first part of the above passage is to be understood infinity in the most literal and unqualified sense of the expression. But what argument does your correspondent use to disprove this position? He inquires, whether "great and infinite are synonymous terms?" The reply to this inquiry is, that in some cases they are not; but that in others they are terms of precisely the same import, and that in the passage under consideration, they have one and the same meaning. Thus, when we speak of the greatness of God we always refer to a greatness that is infinite and immeasurable.

Now that the greatness of the sins of which the accuser of Job speaks in the foregoing passage, were of this description, I prove by the following argument, which, I am confident, will stand the test of sound logic. Your correspondent will undoubtedly admit that right reason and divine revelation can never stand in contradiction to one another, and that what is demonstrated by the former, the latter will never disprove. Now that sin is an infinite evil, has been demonstrated from reason, and my opponent, in attempting to refute the conclusion drawn from the infinity of the being against whom it is committed, laid down a proposition, which, if pursued, completely destroys itself. If reason, therefore, teaches the infinity of sin, the scriptures, wherever they mention its nature as in this passage, must be understood to confirm the deductions of reason, or it inevitably follows, that the bible stands in opposition to reason, and must therefore contain falsehoods and absurdities. Such a conclusion would be im-

material in the last communication of the writer, whose arguments I have undertaken to expose. I will now present your readers with an additional argument in proof of the infinity of sin, and leave them to decide on the strength of it.

In the first place, I would inquire in what does the greatness of sin consist? The reply will unquestionably be, in the greatness of the evil designed by the will. If, therefore, the will has a disposition to do, (if the performance of the desire were in its power,) an infinite evil, would not the sin it is disposed to commit, be of an infinite magnitude? Now every impenitent sinner, who is resolved to reject the overtures of divine mercy, and persevere in the habitual and wilful transgression of the divine law, actually desires the existence of an infinite evil, and the extinction and annihilation of an infinite good. Such a sinner wills and desires the destruction of God himself. For if God is just, he must inflict on every transgressor of his law a punishment proportioned to the sins of which such an offender is guilty. The existence of God, therefore, is an obstacle to his escape from the punishment his offences deserve. And as the sinner wishes to escape such a punishment, and would remove every obstacle which might present to the accomplishment of his wishes, this disposition leads him to will that God should cease to exist. The persevering and habitual sinner, therefore, is guilty in desire, of a deicide. The evil he desires to accomplish is infinite; sin, is therefore an infinite evil.

I am, Mr. Editor, respectfully yours, &c. T.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

SHOCKING WINTER.

Mr. STREETER—I have often been astonished at the extravagant expressions of some of our orthodox writers, as well as preachers, concerning their Deity or Deities; but have never noticed any thing more singular, to say the least, than the following from "Brown's Metaphors."

"O shocking winter, that bestormed, that pained, that froze to death, him who is the Almighty God!"

I have long been a believer in Jesus, and that God gave his Son to die for our sins, according to the scriptures; but I cannot believe that "the Almighty God" ever died, more especially that he ever froze to death! I am aware of the writer's meaning in the above passage, but think it is calculated to mislead most readers. If they receive it according to its most obvious import, and admit that the infinite and Ever-living God, whose very existence is IMMORTALITY, really

suffered death, metaphorically represented by freezing, it must be worse than useless. The doctrine to which that idea belongs, is, in my opinion, of pernicious tendency. It would be more especially so, if advanced before those poor, ignorant people, of whom the Mirror speaks, that had never heard of the death of the Son of God, and as we may well suppose, much less of the "shocking winter," in which "the Almighty God" himself, was bestormed, pained and frozen.

I really wish, Sir, that some person of leisure and adequate talents, would commence a series of numbers, in your paper, under the following text:—"But to us there is but One God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. Howbeit, there is not in every man this knowledge." 1 Cor. viii. 6, 7. My desire is that the true character and identity of God, and of the Lord Jesus, his Son, may be clearly set forth, and supported by scripture quotations; that we may know who those men are, that have not this knowledge. For although I do not belong to your denomination, I am a friend to free discussion of doctrines, and hope, at least, to be tolerated in rejecting the absurd notion, that the Deity in whom we live and move—"froze to death!" B****

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, OCT. 25, 1823.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

Mr. RAND—I observed in the "Mirror" of the 17th instant, a labored answer to the following question; viz.

"Is the same degree of divine influence, which is ineffectual to the conversion of one person, effectual to the conversion of another?" I was pleased with the substance of your remarks, because I conceive it expresses your real sentiments, in a manner whereby they can be easily understood. The substance to which I allude is embraced in the following extract, the remaining part of your answer, being introductory to and defensive of the doctrine it contains.

"Sinners are 'converted,' not by human or created influence, but by the mighty power of God. They are born of the spirit; they become new creatures, and are created in Christ Jesus unto good works. They are the workmanship of God: quickened, or made alive, after they had been dead in trespasses and sins. If regeneration is exclusively the work of God; if means do not produce it, without his influence or en-

effects; therefore it is in no case ineffectual where it is exerted. To speak of "degrees" of divine influence, is to represent the Deity as being finite and weak, like mortal men, who accomplish their purposes with difficulty and labor. When God is pleased to exert his power, it is not difficult for him to bring a Saul, a Manasseh, or a gospel-hardened sinner, out of darkness into light, and make the stoutest heart submit."

To misunderstand such plain language, seems impossible; but how to reconcile your doctrine with the means, which human creatures are using, for the conversion of sinners, is extremely difficult. You are desired to answer the following plain questions, in relation to this important subject.

Question 1. If the conversion of sinners be exclusively the work of God, is it not wholly useless to use any other means, since they must, of course be excluded from producing any effect?

2. If regeneration is the effect of Almighty Power, ought not a man to assume Omnipotence, when he undertakes to convert a sinner?

3. If conversion can no more be produced by human means, than the creation of a world, would not our ministers and missionaries be as well employed in creating worlds, as in striving to convert sinners?

4. If there are no degrees in divine influence, but all are converted on whom it is exerted, how can those be blame-worthy for not being saved, whom God is not pleased to convert; any more than a beast is, for not being created a man, or a man for not being an angel? both being alike impossible?

5. If people in general understood this subject as you do, and really believed that all must and would be converted, on whom the divine influence is exerted, and that all other means are wholly excluded in producing the desired effects; and that it is not difficult for God alone to make the stoutest heart submit, and save as many as he pleases, do you believe they would put themselves to much trouble, in raising money and educating ministers, for the conversion of the heathen?

You see by these serious questions, Sir, that I am unable to discover any propriety, in using means, to effect a work.

which is produced by other means, to the total exclusion of them. I suppose God could exert the same power by which the world was created, on the Hindoos, and others, as well without any created means, as with them; and you say, that if he does exert his power, *they certainly will be converted*; but if he does not, it is because he is not pleased to convert those, whose regeneration would not be at all difficult.

As you informed me, dear sir, *when you was at my house*, that you did not admit controversial discussions into the "Mirror," you may have the privilege of publishing your reply in the *Intelligencer*. You know we agreed to exhibit neighborly civilities and kindness, though differing in speculative theology. You are, therefore, as a neighbor and friend, requested to give me some light on this subject, if it be in your power.—EDITOR.

MR. EDITOR—You are requested to explain the words of Solomon, concerning the final destiny of the righteous and the wicked, as set forth in the following sentence:—"As the tree falls, so it lies." Our young minister has reiterated those words, frequently adding, "and as death leaves us, so judgment will find us," till they have almost lost the *charm* of inspiration.

REPLY.

It may not be improper to inform friend "Charles," that the sentence, of which he requests an explanation, is not found in the writings of Solomon, or any inspired man; but is a bad imitation of a part of a sentence in Eccl. xi. 2, which no more admits of the popular application, than it does of being applied to the fanciful stories of fallen angels. A recurrence to the passage and its connection, can hardly fail to convince every candid reader, that the wise-man was exhorting to deeds of liberality, and promising a certain recompence after many days. His words are,

"Cast thy bread upon the waters; for thou shalt find it after many days. Give a portion to seven, and also to eight; for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth. If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth: and if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be. He that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap."—Eccl. xi. 1-4.

exposition which has been given the clause to which he alludes? After reading Solomon's advice, who can believe it related to the final destiny of the righteous and wicked? Is there any thing said upon that subject? Which tree is the most righteous, the one which *falls* to the north, or to the south?

We think the writer would appear the most wise and prudent, to understand him to inculcate the following lessons of practical religion.

1. "Cast thy bread upon the waters," &c. Or; dispense your charities on the *needy*, though unacquainted with the causes of their suffering; and, sooner or later, you shall have your reward.

2. "Give a portion to seven" &c. Or; be not restricted to relations and particular friends; and as an incentive to duty, remember, *you are liable to become equally destitute*, not knowing what evils shall come upon the earth.

3. "If the clouds be full of rain," &c. That is; take an example from the bountiful providence of God, whose rains descend gratuitously on all. Consider that those objects of charity to whom others should be almoners, are helpless and unprotected, and liable to *fall in the tempest of adversity*, as the tree is laid prostrate by the wind; and whether they perish in *one direction or another*, if they suffer through the neglect and covetousness of the affluent, the guilt will come on the head of those who suffer them to fall.

4. "He that observeth the wind" &c. Or; those who pretend to be charitable, and yet are over-curious in searching out the occasion of suffering and poverty, will be as unlikely to extend the hand of relief, as a man would be to sow, and reap, whose whole time is occupied, in observing the wind and gazing at the clouds. Men of real munificence, will sustain and bless the children of affliction and sorrow, without the expectation of pecuniary recompence.

But extremely irrational and futile it must be, to suppose that an isolated member of a sentence, or the imitation of it, "As the tree falls, so it lies," should express the final condi-

tion of human intelligences. Friend "Charles" is requested to muster up courage enough to ask the "young minister" whether men will not forever remain *in death*, if there is no alteration *after death*. Ask him if we do not read that, tho' "sown in weakness, we shall be raised in power;" though we fall into "corruption, we shall be raised in incorruption," and that "this mortal, shall put on immortality." But if the trees, or men, remain *in the place*, where they fall, will they not remain forever in the grave? The young minister should be careful not to deny the doctrine of the resurrection.

It is lamentable indeed, that admonitions against illiberality, should be pressed into the service of a religious campaign, in which the *parsimonious* clergy, wage pitiless war with the poor & needy sick; and attempt, by a forced construction, to make them believe that, the God of boundless and unchanging goodness, will be more unmerciful towards the *dead*, in another world, than they are in this, to the *sick and needy*! Without bestowing a favor, or presenting an encouragement, these miserable comforters exclaim, "*As the tree falls, so it lies*!" But let us ask them, What have *you done*, Rev. Sirs, which entitles *you* to a better resurrection than others? Have you sold all, and given it to the poor? Are you to be known by your fruits?

PARABLE OF THE SHEEP AND GOATS.

After so long a time, we have made room for the promised illustration of the last parable in the *twenty-fifth* chapter of Matthew. We shall claim the privilege of occupying a suitable portion of each paper in future, (if health and circumstances permit) till the explanation is finished. Our readers will excuse us from paying any particular attention to the preceding part of the chapter, except so far as is necessary, to show the connexion of the whole, with the *twenty-fourth* chapter. As our labors will be liable to misconstruction before the whole explanation is presented, we shall admit no replies, till all is published. We hope, at least, to convince the candid and inquiring reader, that moderation and sound arguments, better become a scriptural illustration, than boisterous assumptions, and implied infallibility.

Mrs. JUDSON'S DRESS.

It is proper to notify our readers, that the account of Mrs. Judson, which we published from the New England Galaxy, is a conversation,

which was true, she was very imprudent in wearing so extremely costly dress, while engaged in a work, demanding such stricken humility. But if the account was unfounded in facts, and the female missionary was grossly misrepresented, we conceive that every ingenuous editor will feel disposed to correct all unfair impressions on the public mind. To us, however, nothing has yet appeared, to warrant a denial of the principal facts, alleged in the account. We have seen the Report of the honorable Committee, appointed by the "Boston Baptist Association at Salem," but it appears to us, quite too exceptionable to merit a place in our paper, as a denial of the first account. The Committee's Report is elaborate, and most cautiously written. It is not that direct and unequivocal denial of the story which elicited it, that a discerning public has a right to expect. We are suspicious that the humble dress, which Mrs. Judson's Baptist friends describe, was purchased for the purpose of shielding her from public censure. They probably heard many unfavorable remarks, and to make her visit more subservient to the Missionary purposes, did not wish her to appear in so splendid a costume. We do not believe that the Committee have come so near the real value of the articles of dress of which so much has been said, as did the author of the story we published. They have valued a dress, but not the dress, to which we allude. Mrs. Judson probably had more than one suit. Though we promise to publish any authentic and positive denial of the account whenever it appears, we feel in duty bound to reject such evasive and cautious contradictions as are found in the report to which we allude. Our readers are soberly requested not to place too much confidence in the clamorous exultations of the vindicators of Mrs. Judson, till it is fairly proved that the exaggeration of the truth, was greater than is common in giving a rhetorical coloring to stories of a similar character.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.—As the editor of the "Missionary" did not insert "Origen's reply to him, at large, but such extracts as he thought proper, we shall pursue the same course. If our friend "Origen" thinks the controversy would be interesting and useful, he is at liberty to answer the editor of the "Missionary"; and as we have sent him the Number containing the reply, it will save occupying more room in our paper, on that mystical subject, than is indispensably necessary. We shall take no part in the controversy, for having in our possession some of the wonderful works of that wonderful man, SWEDENBORG, we are far more gratified with the *correspondences* of his imagination, than with the aerial flights of the immortal Bard, in "Paradise Lost."

THANKSGIVING.

The Governor and Council of this State, have appointed THURSDAY, the *twentieth day of November next*, to be observed as a day of Public Thanksgiving and Praise.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

"Pacificus" has been received and will appear in our next. Several other communications on file will be attended to.

We should be pleased to have our friends "Juvenis," "L. B.," "B. S.," and "S. C." continue their favors.

We have received another note from our esteemed correspondent "Nazareus," informing us that in a few weeks he hopes, a relaxation from professional business will enable him to resume his pen; and then "Petrus" shall receive every attention that his candid inquiries demand.

NOTICE.

Subscribers are reminded that the pay for this volume becomes due on the delivery of the next number. We have published below, a corrected list of Agents, to whom payment can be made. We hope each individual will see the propriety of making punctual remittances.

AGENTS FOR THE INTELLIGENCER.

MAINE.

Anson—Hon. J. Collins, P.M. Green—L. Robbins, Esq. P.M.
Augusta—John Reed. Hope—W. Sweetland, Esq. P.M.
Brunswick—G. W. Holden. Lewiston—D. Read, Esq. P.M.
Belfast—Dr. J. P. Alden. Litchfield—David Burr, Esq.
Bangor—N. Bean, Esq. Livermore—Dr. E. Bradford.
Buckfield—Capt. A. Parsons. Minot & Poland—J. Bartlett.
Bath—Nath'l Swasey. N. Gloucester—M. Bennett, 3d.
Camden—Lewis Ogier. New Sharon—O. Gould.
Canton—Hon. C. Holland. Norway—J. Bartlett.
Castine—Samuel Mendum. Nor. Bridgton—N. Howe, Esq.
Canaan—Joseph Barrett. Paris—Rev. A. Barton.
Durham—Job Sylvester, P.M. Readfield—J. Smith, Esq.
Eastport—B. Folsom.* Saco—E. S. Moulton.
Eddington—Right Stockwell. Stroudwater—Capt. J. Smith.
Farmington—Rev. W. A. Drew. Turner—Col. Cyrus Clark.
Falmouth—John Wait, Esq. Union—Dr. E. Harding.
Fairfield—Levi Barrett, Esq. Waterville—Rev. S. Cobb.
Freeport—Joseph Mitchell. Westbrook—Amasa Fobes.
Gray—John Stimpson. Winthrop—J. A. Pitts.
Gardiner—Parker Sheldon. Wales—Jonathan Plummer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Kingston—D. Bartlett, Esq. Portsmouth—Rev. S. Stroud.
Langdon—Rev. D. Skinner. Richmond—J. Bishop.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Amesbury—Philip Osgood. Salem—
Dunstable—Samuel Roby.
Plymouth—W. Brown, P.

—Rev. R. Bartlett.
—Ingfield—L. Walker, Esq.
—Townshend—A. Doolittle, Esq.
CONNECTICUT.
Providence—S. W. Wheeler. Hartford—Rev. R. Carrique.

* Those who can make it more convenient can pay their bills to Capt. JOHN WAIT, packet master of this port, who is frequently at that place.

MARRIED.

In this town, by Elder S. Rand, Mr. Stephen Burbank, of Hiram, to Miss Abigail Millet, of this town. Capt. Thomas R. Cobb, to Miss Adeline F. Marston. Mr. Joseph Conner to Miss Dorcas Fowler.

By Rev. Mr. Scarlett, Mr. William G. Hart, of Portsmouth, to Mrs. Sally Riggs, of this town.

By the Rev. Mr. Ten Broeck, Mr. Charles F. Kimball to Miss Betsey Waite.

By the Rev. Dr. Payson, Mr. Charles A. Spring, merchant of Boston, to Miss Dorothea B. Norton.

By Rev. Mr. Streeter, Mr. Thomas Browne, to Miss Esther W. Lane. Mr. Benjamin Evans to Miss Eunice Edwards.

In Westbrook, by Rev. Mr. Streeter, Mr. Hiram Jones, to Miss Clarissa Higgins.

DIED.

In this town, Mr. Ebenezer Griffin, aged 62. Mr. Ebenezer Hall, aged 46. Edward Starbird, aged 18. John, son of Mr. Christopher Rand, aged 2 years. Charlotte Jones, youngest child of Mr. William B. Flagg, aged 6 months. Miss Almira Telford, aged 17. Mr. Nicholas Loring. Miss Sophia Bangs, aged 24. Mrs. Mary Weeks, aged 61.

On Friday last week, Mr. Job Runnells, aged 35. During a year's sickness of a lingering consumption, though exercised with much pain, he manifested remarkable patience and reconciliation of mind. He remained firm and joyful, while he retained his reason, in the doctrine of Universal Benevolence, and convinced his anxious and inquisitive friends, that this divine truth is adequate to the support and comfort of those who heartily embrace it, even in the hour of sickness & death.

On the 1st inst. Mrs. Elizabeth Bailey, aged 42. This amiable and worthy woman died of a violent nervous fever, which produced derangement of the most frantic kind, while her strength remained. She was at Capt. J. C. Churchill's during her sickness unto death, and every possible aid was rendered her, that purest friendship and respect could devise.

At Rome, Aug. 20, Pope Pius VII. in his 82d year.

POETRY.

DIVINE IMPRESS.

There's not a tint that paints the rose,
Or decks the lilly fair,
Or streaks the humblest flower that grows,
But Heaven has placed it there!

At early dawn there's not a gale,
Across the landscape driven,
And not a breeze that sweeps the vale,
That is not sent by Heaven!

There's not of grass a simple blade,
Or leaf of lowliest meim,
Where heavenly skill is not displayed,
And heavenly wisdom seen!

There's not a tempest dark and dread,
Or storm that rends the air,
Or blast that sweeps o'er ocean's bed,
But Heaven's own voice is there!

There's not a star whose twinkling light,
Illumes the distant earth,
And cheers the solemn gloom of night,
But mercy gave it birth!

There's not a cloud whose dew distil
Upon the parching clod,
And clothe with verdure vale and hill,
That is not sent by God!

There's not a place in earth's vast round,
In ocean deep or air,
Where skill and wisdom are not found,
For God is every where!

Around, beneath, below, above,
Wherever space extends,
There Heaven displays its boundless love,
And power with mercy blends!

Then rise my soul, and sing His name,
And all his praise rehearse,
Who spread abroad earth's glorious frame,
And built the universe!

Where'er thine earthly lot is cast,
His power and love declare,
Nor think the mighty theme too vast—
For God is every where! [English paper.]

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

THE CHRISTIAN OPITULATOR.....No. IX.

What is the true signification of the word HELL?

Matt. ix. 23 "And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shall be brought down to hell." We believe that people, generally understand by the term *heaven*, a place or state of perfect and unceasing happiness after death;—and by *hell* is understood a place or state of perfect and unceasing misery after natural dissolution. Now if these ideas be correct; when others will acknowledge that it was literally true, the *city of Capernaum* was actually exalted to heaven, the mansions of eternal rest; then also will we allow, that she shall be brought down from those blest abodes to a place or state of eternal misery.—But as it is not probable any one should acknowledge the former, so we shall deny the latter. We consider them both as figurative terms; the *heaven*, meaning the height of worldly prosperity and splendor; the *hell*, "*hades*," the depth of worldly misery and humiliation. See also Luke x. 15, the same.

Matt. xvi. 18; "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The word rendered, *hell*, in this passage is *hades*; and is so very far from intimating it to be a place of endless distress, that we presume no one would wish to have us spend time, to show that it has no such signification. Although death may destroy, and *hades*, or the grave confine the mortal part of mankind, yet they shall not be able to prevail against the undertaking of Jesus Christ, who has engaged to administer the joys of eternal life and immortality, from the slumbers of the tomb. "Death is" not "an eternal sleep," nor *hades*, an eternal confinement.

Matt. xxiii. 15, "Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two fold more the child of hell than yourselves." Hell, as here used, simply signifies the torment, perplexity and discontent, which, amidst the heat of con-

tention, an immoderate zeal for proselytism, always produces. In this heat of dissention, all the fierce and warlike passions ravage the homely peace of him, whose bosom they invade. These scribes and pharisees, being hypocrites, were emphatically the "children" of these passions. They neither enjoyed the peace of true religion themselves, nor could suffer their proselytes to enjoy it. The distinction, made in this passage, between them and their proselytes; in that, the latter were two fold more the children of hell than themselves, consists in this: The pharisees rested, in a manner, upon their *own* notions; they in part satisfied themselves with what they had themselves invented and obtained;—but their proselytes, having just left a system, from which they no longer derived support; looking to the scribes and pharisees for something more valuable, and finding themselves deceived; rested in fact upon *nothing*. Whichever way they turned, they saw doubts and uncertainty. Hence they were doubly the children of hell, than their masters. *Gehenna* is the word translated hell in this text, and is a term very justly suited to represent the *flames* enkindled by contending religious factions. The proselytes gained by such contention, are children, begotten of passions most wicked.

Matt. xxiii. 33, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (*Gehenna*.) In order that the word, under consideration in this passage, should give us to understand, a place of fire and brimstone, burning eternally; it should first be proved that the term hell does signify such a place. But this never has been, and never can be done. Now there is nothing, in connexion here, that can warrant a reference to any *definite place*; there is nothing *here* that *proves* it. Consequently, this text gives no countenance to the popular notion of hell torments. But upon supposition that, the "hell" here named is literal, we shall also suppose the "*serpents* and *generation of vipers*," to be taken literally also, and then the admonition does not concern us, of the human race. No, *the terms are figurative*. They, who have "the poison of asps under their tongue;" "who bite and devour the innocent," can by no means escape the condemnation or damnation of a flashing conscience.

Luke xvi. 23, "And in hell, he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." We have no doubt but that from a literal acceptance of these words, people have conscientiously concluded that they gave support to the popular notion concerning hell. For here, it will be said, that the rich man went to hell after death, and that in hell he was also in torment. And as he was tormented after death, and that too in hell; and as we have no account, in this connexion, of a deliverance from that misery, people have honestly concluded, that there must be misery after death, and that eternal. But let us, for a few moments, admit this to be a literal representation of an actual case, and see how it agrees with the same common opinion. Lazarus was a poor man full of sores, and on that account went to heaven. The other was a rich man who fared sumptuously every day; he died, and on this account went down to eternal misery. Now there is nothing else intimated, in this account which was the point of separation between their characters, beside poverty and riches. Lazarus is literally in heaven, and not only so, he is also there in *Abraham's bosom*. The rich man goes to be eternally punished. It appears, (to continue our supposition, that this is a literal account) that the hell, in which the rich man was miserable, was so adjacent to heaven, that he and Lazarus could converse together, and be heard distinctly. The rich man, contrary to all rules of the society of devils, expresses a great desire to go over to heaven. (But why should he wish to go there, if the common opinion be correct, that a wicked man, could he be introduced into heaven would be more miserable there, than he could be even in hell?) And not only so, Lazarus also is desirous to go to hell, to alleviate the distress of the rich man. (Very contrary to the common sentiment, that the inhabitants of heaven rejoice over the misery of the damned in hell.) The rich man moreover continues to be *so benevolent*, and *so hostile to the desire of devils*, that he importunes for a messenger to be sent back to the Earth to warn his brethren not to come to the same place.

Now there is something so contradictory in all this,

that it needs but to be seen, to be discredited. *It is not a literal account*; it is a *parable*, intended to represent the fall of the Levitical priesthood and the taking into the promises of faithful Abraham, the poor and wounded gentiles. The high priest under the Law, who wore "purple and fine robes," was represented by a "rich man." When Christ came into the world to set up his kingdom, "he died" a political death, and was, figuratively, buried in "*hades*" or the grave, (the word, rendered hell in this passage.) The gentiles, poor and despised, represented by Lazarus, (which, if we mistake not, signifies "a poor man") were carried by apostles or messengers, (who are also called *angels*,) into the faith of Abraham, represented by "*Abraham's bosom*." The *hell*, into which the observers of the Law were cast after their political death, was that state of mortification, which resulted from their seeing the despised gentiles taken into the favor of the gospel, while they, themselves, were thrust out. We could very easily go on to show the meaning of the remaining figures in this parable, but as we purpose to be brief, and it not being anticipated in our design, we forbear. Enough we believe has been said to convince any one, who will examine in a good spirit of candor, that the popular opinion of this parable is unfounded, and that consequently, the hell therein mentioned does not, and cannot mean, what many suppose it to signify. ORIGEN.

SOMETHING MYSTERIOUS.

Our orthodox clergy insist with great earnestness and much gravity, that the Creator, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, and rendered their salvation certain and unavoidable; also, that the rest of mankind were predestinated to endless misery, and their ruin made equally certain and unavoidable. After these fundamental points of faith are supposed to be well supported, in a sermon, the preacher proceeds with all his learning and theological wisdom, to bring poor sinners, who are in a state of unbelief, to a sense of their awful situation by nature, and to realize that unless they repent of their sins and believe the true doctrine, they must, without doubt, be damned everlastingly. Now the mystery lies here: How can those be in danger of being lost whose salvation was made unavoidable from all eternity? and how can repentance and faith save those whose everlasting destruction was made unavoidable from all eternity, by the decree of an unchangeable God? Suppose that all those who were predestinated to endless ruin should repent of their sins and believe that they were thus reprobated from all eternity, would their believing this faith save them, directly contrary to itself. And allowing that all those who were elected unto salvation should live and die in unbelief, would their unbelief render their unavoidable salvation null?

Whether this is the mystery of godliness, or the mystery of iniquity, let the reader judge, after due deliberation. But there is more mystery, of the same sort, which, when the reader has safely disposed of the preceding, he will know where to place, and to whose account it ought to be credited. I mean the mystery of what is held up about the devil.

We are constantly told that the devil is all the time employed in using all the arts of which he is master, to prevent people from believing the true orthodox creed, that they may, for their unbelief, be consigned to his kingdom of darkness forever. But how does it happen that this arch deceiver has never yet found out, what is well known to the clergy, (viz.) that almighty God did his business for him, before creation, by assigning him his kingdom, and determining the number of his subjects? And I would ask again, where the devil is on every sabbath, that he should never yet have found out that he cannot so deceive even one of the elect as to induce the Creator to give him up to him?

Should the reader have the same view of these mysteries which I entertain, he will be led to say, that both devil and preachers might as well be employed about something else, if the latter could get as good a living as they now do; for it is certain that neither of them are able to change the final destiny of any of the human race, and the preacher does not even flatter men that religion is worth having for any benefit it is to its possessor in this world. In this particular, according to their own concession, they are less inviting than satan is, for they allow that he affords much pleasure and prosperity to his servants in this life.—[U. Magazine.]

THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER

IS PUBLISHED EVERY OTHER SATURDAY MORNING,

AT No. 6, EXCHANGE-STREET,

BY RUSSELL STREETER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—One dollar per annum—payable at the end of six months. No paper discontinued until arrearages are settled.

TODD & SMITH.....PRINTERS.